UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,818	04/30/2001	Kristian Vaajala	944-003.031	2309

4955 7590 11/03/2005

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/845,818	VAAJALA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *84-128* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *84-128* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 08/22/2005.

Claims 84-128 are pending in this application. Claims 84, 104, and 122 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 08/22/2005, claims 84, 104, and 122 were amended and claims 123-128 were added as new. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 84-88, 90-93, 95-100, 102-108, 110-118, and 120-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1).

In regards to claim 84, Hedberg teaches a method for displaying graphical information on a display of an electronic device sized for hand-held use (page 5, lines 20-24), said display providing an image in a window having an extent limited by the size of the electronic device, comprising the steps of: receiving an input windowing signal actuated by a user of said electronic device (Page 6, Lines 33-35), said windowing signal having a magnitude indicative of a selected portion of a whole extent of said graphical information greater than displayable at once as said image over said limited extent of said window (page 4, lines 3-9, *i.e. – different magnification or different parts*), and displaying said selected portion of said whole extent of said graphical information on said limited extent window, in response to said user actuated input windowing signal

(page 4, lines 10-21); receiving a second input windowing signal actuated by said user having a magnitude indicative of a scrolling of said selected portion of said graphical information (Page 6, Lines 23-26); and displaying said selected portion of said graphical information shifted or scrolled according to said second input windowing signal within said window (Page 6, Lines 23-26).

As per claim 85, which is dependent on claim 84, Hedberg teaches that the graphical information has a given resolution available over said whole extent of said graphical information and wherein said step of displaying said portion of said whole extent of said graphical information is at a resolution less than or equal to said given resolution (page 6, lines 14-22, *the hand-held display device shows graphical information at a lower resolution than original graphical information*).

As per claim 86, which is dependent on claim 84, Hedberg teaches a method wherein the step to receiving a first input windowing signal and said step of displaying said selected portion of said whole extent comprise the steps of: receiving an input zoom signal actuated by said user of said electronic device, said input zoom signal having a magnitude indicative of said selected portion of said whole extent of said graphical information, wherein said graphical information has a given resolution available over said whole extent of said graphical information greater than displayable at once in said window, and displaying said given resolution over said selected portion of said extent of said graphical information (page 6-7, lines 33-6).

As per claim 87, which is dependent on claim 84 Hedberg teaches a method wherein at least one of said first input windowing signal and said second input

windowing signal is provided in response to said user actuating a finger – or hand – actuated control device associated with said electronic device (Page 6, Line 34).

As per claim 88, which is dependent on claim 87, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said control device includes one or more finger-actuatable buttons or keys (page 6, line 34).

As per claim 90, which is dependent on claim 87, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said control device includes one ore more joysticks (page 1, lines 15-23).

As per claim 91, which is dependent on claim 84, Hedberg teaches a wherein said at least one of said first input windowing and said second input windowing signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (Page 6, Lines 33-35).

As per claim 92, which is dependent on claim 92, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said moving includes moving said device with changing velocity (page 4, lines 3-9, *a force accelerometer measures changing velocity*).

As per claim 93, which is dependent on claim 86, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said first input windowing signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (Page 6, Lines 1-3) and said second input windowing signal is provided in response to said user actuating a finger- or hand-actuated control device associated with said electronic device (Page 8, Lines 19-23).

As per claim 95, which is dependent on claim 85, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said at least one of said first input windowing signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (Page 6, Lines 1-3).

As per claim 96, which is dependent on claim 95, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said moving includes moving said device with changing velocity (page 4, lines 3-9, *a force accelerometer measures changing velocity*).

As per claim 97, which is dependent on claim 86, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said input zoom signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (Page 6, Lines 1-3).

As per claim 98, which is dependent on claim 97, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said moving includes moving said device with changing velocity (page 4, lines 3-9, *a force accelerometer measures changing velocity*).

As per claim 99, which is dependent on claim 84, Hedberg teaches a method further comprising the step of displaying a stationary pointer on said limited extent window for use in selecting a link in its vicinity (page 7, lines 20-29).

As per claim 100, which is dependent on claim 99, Hedberg teaches the step of receiving a user entered link selection signal for said selecting a link (page 7, lines 20-29, *i.e. – "under" a fixed pointer*).

As per claim 102, which is dependent on claim 99, Hedberg teaches the that the step of displaying is carried out only when link is positioned in said vicinity of said stationary pointer (page 7, lines 20-29).

As per claim 103, which is dependent on claim 99, Hedberg teaches that the stationary pointer is positioned in a central position within said limited extent window

(page 7, lines 20-29, and figure 6, element 15, *pointer is positioned in the center of the display*).

Claim 104 is in the same context as claim 84; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 105 is in the same context as claim 85; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 106 is in the same context as claim 86; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 107 is in the same context as claim 87; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 108 is in the same context as claim 88; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 110 is in the same context as claim 90; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 111 is in the same context as claim 91; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 112 is in the same context as claim 92; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 113, which is dependent on claim 106, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said first input windowing signal is provided in response to said user moving said electronic device (Page 6, Lines 1-3).

Claim 114 is in the same context as claim 96; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 115 is in the same context as claim 97; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 116 is in the same context as claim 98; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 117 is in the same context as claim 99; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 118 is in the same context as claim 100; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 120 is in the same context as claim 102; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 121 is in the same context as claim 103; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 122 is in the same context as claim 84; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 123, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said second input windowing signal is for said scrolling with fine granularity said portion of said whole extent of said graphical information selected for display on said limited extent window by said first input windowing signal (Page 6, Lines 23-26, the user controls the movement therefore the user controls the granularity of the scrolling).

Claim 124 is in the same context as claim 123; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 125 is in the same context as claim 123; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 126, Hedberg teaches a method wherein said scrolling is carried out vertically, horizontally, or in some combination thereof (Page 6, Lines 23-26).

Claim 127 is in the same context as claim 126; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 128 is in the same context as claim 126; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 89 and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1) and further in view of Masunaga (US 5563631).

As per claim 89, which is dependent on claim 87, the teachings of Hedberg in regards to claim 87 have been discussed above. Hedberg does not disclose one or more finger-actuatable user input devices includes plural finger-actuatable rollers.

Masunaga teaches a method wherein one or more finger-actuatable user input devices includes plural finger-actuatable rollers (column 9, lines 43-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hedberg to include a finger-actuatable roller devices to provide input, as taught by Masunaga, with the motivation to allow a simple and effective control of small personal digital devices (column 2, line 10).

Claim 109 is in the same context as claim 89; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 94 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1) and further in view of Flack et al. (US 6288704).

In regards to claim 94, Hedberg teaches all the limitations of claim 91. Hedberg does not teach a method wherein said moving includes moving with respect to sensible objects. Flack teaches that the moving includes moving with respect to sensible objects (column 4, lines 14-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hedberg with the teachings of Flack and include a method of moving with respect to sensible objects with the motivation to provide simple and convenient method to control the display contents (Flack, Column 3, Line 30).

Claims 101 and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedberg (WO 99/32960 A1) in view of Microsoft Word (2000) Screen Shots.

As per claim 101, Hedberg teaches all the limitations of claim 99. Hedberg does not teach a method further comprising the step of changing a color or shape of said stationary pointer when in said vicinity of said link. Word 2000 teaches displaying a stationary pointer on limited window for use in selecting a link (See Figures 1-3) and displaying the color or shape of said stationary pointer when in the vicinity of a link. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hedberg with the teachings of Word and include a means to change the color or shape of a pointer when in the vicinity of a link with the motivation to indicate to the user when it is possible to select and activate the link.

Claim 119 is in the same context as claim 101; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner notes that in this Office Action claims 84-121 were treated as previously presented and claims 122-128 were treated as new. Though claim 122 was earlier presented via a preliminary amendment, the Examiner was not made aware of

the amendment. The Examiner reminds the Applicant that if there is an error in an Office Action, the Applicant has thirty days to file a request for a corrected action.

The Applicant argues that in the Hedberg reference there is not second input windowing signal indicative of scrolling. The Examiner disagrees. Every movement in Hedberg is a windowing signal (Page 6, Lines 1-3 and 23-26). Different movements result in either the magnification of the image and/or the displaying different parts of the screen (i.e. scrolling) (Page 6, Lines 1-3, 23-26, and 33-35).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BP